

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TRAVELERS CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY as  
Administrator for RELIANCE INSURANCE COMPANY,  
Plaintiff,

- against -

DORMITORY AUTHORITY – STATE OF NEW YORK, TDX  
CONSTRUCTION CORP., and KOHN PEDERSEN FOX  
ASSOCIATES, P.C.,

Defendants.

AND THIRD AND FOURTH PARTY ACTIONS.

07 Civ. 6915 (DLC)

**ANSWER OF DASNY  
AND TDX TO  
COUNTERCLAIMS  
CONTAINED IN  
OHIO CASUALTY'S  
ANSWER TO  
AMENDED FOURTH-  
PARTY COMPLAINT**

Defendants/Third-Party Plaintiffs Dormitory Authority of the State of New York ("DASNY") and TDX Construction Corp. ("TDX"), by their attorneys, Holland & Knight LLP, answer the counterclaims contained in fourth-party defendant Ohio Casualty Insurance Company's ("OCIC") Answer to the Amended Fourth-Party Complaint, dated April 10, 2008 ("OCIC's Counterclaims"), as follows:

ANSWERING THE "FIRST COUNT"

1. Paragraph 1 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims merely repeats and realleges its answers to the Fourth-Party Complaint, and DASNY and TDX are not required to respond thereto. To the extent that DASNY and TDX are required to respond, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the First Count.

2. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

3. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

4. The allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the First Count.

5. The allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the First Count.

6. The allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the First Count.

7. The allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the First Count.

8. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

9. The allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the First Count.

10. The allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the First Count.

11. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

12. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

13. The allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the First Count.

14. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 14 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

15. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 15 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

16. The allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 16 of the First Count.

17. The allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 17 of the First Count.

18. The allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 18 of the First Count.

19. The allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 19 of the First Count.

20. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 20 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

21. The allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 21 of the First Count.

22. The allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 22 of the First Count.

23. The allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 23 of the First Count.

24. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 24 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

25. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 25 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

26. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 26 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

27. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 27 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

28. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 28 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

29. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 29 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

30. The allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the First Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 30 of the First Count.

ANSWERING THE "SECOND COUNT"

31. Paragraph 1 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims merely repeats and realleges its answers to the Fourth-Party Complaint, and DASNY and TDX are not required to respond thereto. To the extent that DASNY and TDX are required to respond, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Second Count.

32. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

33. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 3 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

34. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 4 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

35. The allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 5 of the Second Count.

36. The allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 6 of the Second Count.

37. The allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 7 of the Second Count.

38. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 8 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

39. The allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a



response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 9 of the Second Count.

40. DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 10 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims.

41. The allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Second Count.

42. The allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 12 of the Second Count.

43. The allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Second Count of OCIC's Counterclaims state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, DASNY and TDX are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained in paragraph 13 of the Second Count.

#### FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

44. OCIC's Counterclaims fail to state a cause of action against DASNY upon which relief may be granted.

#### SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE


45. OCIC's Counterclaims fail to state a cause of action against TDX upon which relief may be granted.



**WHEREFORE**, DASNY and TDX demand judgment dismissing OCIC's Counterclaims in their entirety as against them, together with the costs and disbursements of this action, attorneys' fees, and such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York  
May 5, 2008

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
*Attorneys for Defendants Dormitory  
Authority of the State of New York and  
TDX Construction Corp.*

By:   
Stephen B. Shapiro  
Timothy B. Froessel  
195 Broadway  
New York, New York 10007  
(212) 513-3200

To: All counsel of Record

# 5514402\_v1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TRAVELERS CASUALTY AND SURETY  
COMPANY as Administrator for RELIANCE  
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

- against -

DORMITORY AUTHORITY – THE STATE OF NEW  
YORK, TDX CONSTRUCTION CORP., and KOHN  
PEDERSEN FOX ASSOCIATES, P.C.,

Defendants.

DORMITORY AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF  
NEW YORK and TDX CONSTRUCTION CORP.,

Third-Party Plaintiffs,

- against -

TRATAROS CONSTRUCTION, INC.,

Third-Party Defendant.

Third and Fourth Party Actions.

Case No. 07 Civ. 6915 (DLC)  
ECF CASE


**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

KAREN L. HIPPIER hereby declares the following to be true under penalty of perjury:

On May 5, 2008, I caused the foregoing Answer of DASNY and TDX Construction Corp. to Counterclaims Contained in Ohio Casualty's Answer to Amended Fourth Party Complaint to be served upon all parties listed in the attached service list, at the addresses designated for service by depositing same, enclosed in a properly addressed wrapper, first-class postage, in an official depository under the exclusive care of the United States Postal Service within the State of New York.

On May 5, 2008, I caused the foregoing Answer of DASNY and TDX Construction Corp. to Counterclaims Contained in Ohio Casualty's Answer to Amended Fourth Party Complaint to be served via electronic filing upon all parties currently appearing in this litigation.

Dated: New York, New York  
May 5, 2008

  
Karen L. Hippner

Sworn to before me this date  
May 5, 2008

  
Notary Public

**BO FEELY**  
**Notary Public, State of New York**  
**NO. 01FE6161594**  
**Qualified in New York County**  
**Commission Expires February 26, 2011**

#4950324\_v1

SERVICE LIST

David C. Dreifuss, Esq.  
DREIFUSS, BONACCI & PARKER, LLP  
26 Columbia Turnpike  
North Entrance  
Florham Park, New Jersey. 07932

*Counsel for Travelers Casualty & Surety Co.  
& Trataros Construction, Inc.*

David Abramovitz, Esq.  
ZETLIN & DeCHIARA LLP  
801 Second Avenue  
New York, New York 10017

*Counsel for Kohn Pedersen Fox Assocs.*

Jeremy Platek, Esq.  
O'CONNOR, REDD, GOLLIHUE &  
SKLARIN, LLP  
200 Mamaroneck Avenue  
White Plains, New York 10601

*Counsel for Bartec Industries, Inc.*

Martin P. Lavelle  
Green & Lavelle  
110 William Street, 18th Floor  
New York, New York 10038

*Counsel for National Union Fire  
Ins. Co.*

Diana E. Goldberg  
Mound Cotton Wollan & Greengrass  
One Battery Park Plaza  
New York, N.Y. 10004

*Counsel for Allied World Assurance Co.*

Joseph DeDonato  
Morgan Melhuish Abrutyn  
651 West. Mt. Pleasant Ave.  
Suite 200  
Livingston, New Jersey 07039

*Counsel for Ohio Casualty Ins. Co.*

Suzin L. Raso, Esq.  
Goldberg Segalla LLP  
170 Hamilton Avenue  
White Plains, N.Y. 10601

*Counsel for Dayton Superior Chem. Corp.*

Robert M. Wasko  
Torre, Lentz, Gamell, Gary  
& Rittmaster, LLP  
226 West 26<sup>th</sup> Street – 8<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
New York, N.Y. 10001

*Counsel for Carolina Casualty Ins. Co.*

John P. DeFilippis, Esq.  
Carroll, McNulty & Kull, LLC  
570 Lexington Avenue  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022

*Counsel for United States Fire Ins. Co.*

Michael S. Miller  
Tompkins, McGuire, Wachenfeld & Barry  
140 Broadway – 51<sup>st</sup> Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10005

*Counsel for Lumberman's Mutual Cas. Co.*

Robert R. Brooks-Rigolosi  
Segal McCambridge Singer & Mahoney, Ltd.  
830 Third Avenue, Suite 400  
New York, N.Y. 10022

*Counsel for Specialty Construction Brands,  
Inc. t/a TEC*

Lance J. Kalik  
Riker Danzig Scherer Hyland & Perretti LLP  
Headquarters Plaza  
Morristown, New Jersey 07962

*Counsel for Harleysville Ins. Co. of N.J.*

S. Dwight Stephens  
Melito & Adolfsen  
233 Broadway, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, N.Y. 10279

*Counsel for Zurich American Ins. Co.*

Richard P. Dyer  
Thelen Reid & Priest, LLP  
875 Third Avenue  
New York, N.Y. 10022

*Counsel for LBL Skysystems, Inc.*

Donald George Sweetman  
Gennet, Kallmann, Antin & Robinson, P.C.  
6 Campus Drive  
Parsippany, NJ 07054

*Counsel for Great American Ins. Co.*

Terrence O'Connor, Esq.  
O'Connor & Golder  
24 North Washington  
Port Washington, N.Y. 11050

*Counsel for Jordan Panel Systems Corp.*

Stephen P. Schreckinger  
Gogick, Byrne & O'Neill, LLP  
11 Broadway, Suite 1560  
New York, N.Y. 10004

*Counsel for Weidinger Assoc.,  
Castro-Blanco Piscioneri  
& Arquitectonica*

Martin A. Schwartzberg  
L'Abbate, Balkan, Colavita & Contini  
1001 Franklin Avenue  
Garden City, N.Y. 11530

*Counsel for Cosentini Associates, Inc.*

George J. Manos  
Bollinger, Ruberry & Garvey  
500 West Madison Street  
Suite 2300  
Chicago, IL 60661

*Counsel for Kemper Casualty*

Terrence O'Connor, Esq.  
Kalb & Rosenfeld, P.C.  
1470 Bruckner Blvd.  
Bronx, N.Y. 10473

*Of Counsel for Jordan Panel Systems Corp.*